

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application.

Claim 30 is canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Claims 1-12 were previously canceled. Claims 13-29, and 31-33 are pending. All pending claims except claims 15, 16, and 20 are amended. Claims 13, 21, and 27 are independent.

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Reasons for Entry of Amendments

At the outset, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered into the Official File in view of the fact that the amendments to the claims automatically place the application in condition for allowance.

In the alternative, if the Examiner does not agree that this application is in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered for the purpose of appeal. This Amendment reduces the issues on appeal by canceling claim 30. This Amendment was not presented at an earlier date in view of the fact that the Examiner has just now presented new grounds for rejection in this Final Office Action.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 13-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,917,915 to Hirose in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,539,827 to Liu; and

Claims 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent

No. 5,917,915 to Hirose in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,539,827 to Liu; and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,867,579 to Saito.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

While not conceding the appropriateness of any of the rejections, but merely to expedite the prosecution of the instant application, claim 13 is amended herein to recite a combination of method steps directed to a method for decrypting an encrypted digital data file, including inter alia the steps of:

receiving a reencrypted data file, wherein a portion of the reencrypted data file has been partially decrypted and reencrypted in a first decryption unit; and

using a second decryption unit to decrypt the received reencrypted data file, wherein the second decryption unit is different from the first decryption unit.

In addition, independent claim 21 is amended herein to recite a combination of elements directed to a digital data decryption system, including, inter alia,

a first decryption unit for decrypting a portion of the encrypted data file while leaving the remaining portion of the data file encrypted, thereby creating a partially decrypted data file; and

a second decryption unit for subsequently decrypting the partially decrypted data file.

Further, claim 27 is amended herein to recite a combination of method steps directed to a method for decrypting an encrypted digital data file, including, inter alia, the steps of:

using the first decryption unit to decrypt a portion of the data file received in the first receiving unit while leaving the remaining portion of the data file encrypted;

reencrypting the decrypted data file; and
using a second decryption unit for decrypting the reencrypted data file.

It is respectfully submitted that the combinations of elements and steps set forth in independent claims 13, 21 and 27 are not disclosed or made obvious by the applied prior art of record, including Hirose, Liu, and Saito.

The Applicants respectfully submit that none of the references cited by the Examiner suggest a second decryption unit for decrypting the reencrypted data file, as taught by the presently claimed invention.

In other words, decrypting and reencrypting of data file by the first decryption unit is separate from and plays no role whatsoever in the decrypting of the reencrypted data file by the second decryption unit. No combination of the references cited by the Examiner, teaches or suggests the system or the method of the present invention.

Moreover, the none of the references cited by the Examiner indicate that there was any recognition of the problem faced by the present inventors. As such, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in his rejections.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the applied prior art of record does not disclose or render obvious the present invention as recited in independent claims 13, 21 and 27. It is respectfully submitted that independent claims 13, 21 and 27 are allowable.

Application No. 09/527,670
Amendment dated August 5, 2004
Reply to Office Action dated April 5, 2004

Docket No. 0630-0983P
Art Unit: 2136
Page 10 of 11

Since the dependent claims depend from these allowable independent claims, they should also be allowable for at least the reasons set forth above, as well as for the additional features provided by these claims. Accordingly, all pending claims should be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), the Applicants respectfully petition for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a reply in connection with the present application, and the required fee of \$110.00 is attached hereto.

If any issues remain, however, the Examiner is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50, 786) at 703-205-8000 in an effort to expedite prosecution.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By: _____

James T. Eller, Jr., #39,538

P. O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

JTE/CTT/te

